C. L. C.

JANUARY 1962

FIFTY CENTS

MONTHLY REVIEW

AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

VOL. 13

9

THE COMMON MARKET

THE EDITORS

BRITAIN AND THE COMMON MARKET

KONNI ZILLIACUS

TWO REPORTS FROM CUBA

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENTS

Marriage and Divorce in the USSR

ALICE RICHARDS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTENTS | VOLUME THIRTEEN NUMBER NINE JANUARY 1962

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: The Common Market 385
BRITAIN AND THE COMMON MARKET by Konni Zilliacus 397
TWO REPORTS FROM CUBA by Special Correspondents 406
MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE IN THE USSR by Alice Richards 416
WORLD EVENTS by Scott Nearing 424

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly except July and August when bimonthly, and copyright, ©1961, by Monthly Review, Inc. Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.
EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS: 333 Sixth Avenue, New York 14, New York. Telephone: CHelsea 2-6494.
NEWSSTAND DISTRIBUTOR: B. De Boer, 102 Beverly Road, Bloomfield, N. J.
SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One Year—$5; two years—$9.
By 1st class mail—United States $7; everywhere else $8.
By air mail—No. America $9; So. America $14; Europe $18; Asia and Africa $24.
EDITORS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

How to increase the number of student subscribers? This is a perennial question to which we are still seeking answers. So we have decided to try a special introductory sub for the remainder of the college year (January through May), to which we will add a free copy of last summer's special double issue on "Cuba and Communism." The price is $2, a little over *half* the regular price. If you are a student, you can take advantage of this offer yourself. If you aren't, you can also take advantage of it—by sending MR for five months to your student acquaintances. Incidentally, analysis of the audience at the recent MR Associates meeting in New York, at which Paul Baran spoke, showed a considerably higher proportion of students than has been usual at Associates meetings in the past. Maybe the time is ripe for a push to expand student circulation. At any rate, let's give it a try.

Recently, Elsie Tyndale, one of our "old faithful" subscribers, died, leaving a most welcome bequest to MR. We take this opportunity to express our gratitude and to honor her memory. May we suggest that others may wish to act similarly to provide continuing support after death for causes they believed in during their lifetime. If so, a simple clause inserted

(*continued on inside back cover*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE COMMON MARKET

During the past month, the Kennedy administration has begun one of the most intensive campaigns to "condition" public opinion in recent memory. The purpose is to build up support for new foreign trade legislation to replace the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which expires next June. At the very center of this "educational" effort stands an entity called the Common Market. According to administration spokesmen from Kennedy down, the formation of the Common Market presents the United States with both a threat and an opportunity. To avert the threat and cash in on the opportunity, new legislation is needed which would allow the government to lower tariffs across the board in exchange for similar concessions by the Common Market. Armed with such powers, the administration could open up vast new outlets for American exports, and this in turn would enable the United States to rectify a weakness in its balance of payments which has become chronic in recent years and now threatens the nation's dominant position in the "free world."

So runs the argument which we have already heard many times and doubtless will hear many more times in the coming months. To understand what lies behind it, hence what its real significance may be, one must obviously first have a reasonably clear idea of what the Common Market is all about. This, however, is something which, if our experience is at all reliable, very few people have, even among those who are most ready to hold forth on the subject. To be sure, almost any regular reader of the daily press can tell you that the Common Market is a customs union of six Western European countries (West Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxemburg). But if you press for further information, you are quite likely to draw a blank.

Now it is perfectly true that the Common Market is a customs union of the Six, but there is no doubt that it is also a good deal more than that. The difficulty comes in any at-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tempt to say just how much more. If one approaches this problem via the network of treaties and constitutions which define the legal existence of the Common Market, one can get quickly lost in a forest where only individual trees are visible. And much of the literature on the Common Market, which has already reached library proportions, is so detailed and so loaded with cumbersome tariff and trade statistics that even the conscientious student may be tempted to throw up his hands in despair. Altogether, this is a case in which it is easy to get lots of information but very hard to get even a little understanding.

Under these circumstances it may be useful to try a different approach. Let us neglect legalisms and details and attempt instead to view the Common Market in its broadest contours as an international and historical phenomenon.

The Common Market had its origins in the European Coal and Steel Community (often referred to as the "Schuman Plan") which came into operation in 1951. There were two main forces behind the Coal and Steel Community: first, the desire of the French, apparently crippled by their defeat and occupation in World War II, to bring German heavy industry under effective international control; and second, the desire of the great interlocked combines that dominate Western Europe's coal and steel production to expand their markets and perfect a control and planning apparatus which would enable them to exploit these markets more profitably. The first of these aims proved to be both unrealistic and ephemeral. West Germany, aided and abetted by the United States, soon became the leading Western European power, more controlling than controlled. But the Great combines (Thyssen, Klöckner, Flick, Röchling, ARBED, Schneider Creusot, de Wendel, and the rest) had every reason to be satisfied with the results achieved by the Coal and Steel Community. A precedent was established which the rest of Western European Big Business soon became eager to follow.

To understand what happened next, one must recall something of the postwar political history of Western Europe. Everywhere in the first years after the war, the radical tide, which began to flow soon after the Nazi invasion of the USSR, swept the left-wing parties either into office (as, for example, in Britain) or into coalition governments professing markedly re-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

formist aims (as in France and Italy). With economic conditions failing to improve, and in some cases actually deteriorating, the radicalization of the masses continued, and for a while in 1947 (the strikes in the north of France) and 1948 (the Italian general elections) it seemed as though all Europe stood on the brink of social revolution. Then came the turning point. Adopting the Marshall Plan, the United States poured billions of dollars into an all-out rescue effort. The Left was unceremoniously ejected from coalition governments. West Germany was established as an independent country and given the means of rapid economic recovery. By the time of Labor's defeat in the British general election of 1951, conservatism had firmly entrenched itself in power throughout the whole area between the Elbe and the Atlantic Ocean. On the continent, the forces behind these newly emergent right-wing governments were similar from country to country and produced a political constellation which, despite variations, can be taken as fundamentally uniform throughout the region. All the positions of real power were occupied by trusted representatives of the big industrialists and financiers. At the same time, however, they held these positions by the will of electoral majorities made up of three main elements: a strongly anti-socialist middle class, a Catholic peasantry, and that considerable section of the working class which was enjoying prosperity and interested in little else. As long as the economic upswing continued—as it did with but minor interruptions during the decade of the 1950's—these regimes proved to be remarkably stable and shock-resistant.

This, then, was the political situation in Western Europe when the success (from the point of view of its founders and chief beneficiaries) of the Coal and Steel Community became evident. Big Business was in power by the will of the people and enjoyed wide latitude to pursue whatever policies it considered to be in its own best interests. What's more, the various national segments of Big Business were so closely intertwined in a maze of financial, marketing, and technological overlaps and agreements that one can hardly speak of *international* divisions or conflicts. What divisions and conflicts did exist—and of course there were many—cut across rather than ran along national boundaries. Under these conditions, what more natural

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than that the governments of Western Europe should embark upon a program of generalizing the Coal and Steel Community to embrace the entire economy of the region? And that's precisely what the Common Market is, a generalization of the Coal and Steel Community. It became a reality with the signing of the Treaty of Rome by the six nations in March of 1957.

In every respect, the Common Market is tailored to the needs and devoted to the service of the international Big Business interests which created it. Unless this is understood and kept in mind, very little sensible or meaningful can be said about the institution. On the other hand, if this fact is understood and kept in mind, much that might otherwise be obscure appears to be quite natural and logical.

What Big Business wants is not only a large protected *market*. It also wants a large area in which it can operate freely and under uniformly favorable legal and socio-economic conditions. Both of these desiderata are promised by the Common Market. All tariffs among the Six will eventually be abolished, thus creating an integrated market of some 170 million people. Around this there will be a uniform tariff wall of a markedly protectionist character. External tariffs are to be a simple unweighted average of the pre-existing rates of the member states, a formula which will yield a higher tariff wall than would result if the individual rates were weighted in proportion to the volume of trade to which they apply. Taken as a whole, therefore, it is clear that the Common Market represents a step in the direction not of freer trade but of more protection. Within the protected area, all restrictions on the movement of both capital and labor are to be removed, and economic policies (affecting taxes, labor legislation, welfare services, etc.) are to be "harmonized." Free competition is enshrined as the sacred guiding principle of the whole enterprise, and member governments are strictly enjoined against any measures which would contravene it. What is meant by free competition, however, must be judged in the light of the following considerations: (1) Prices and production of agricultural commodities are to be strictly controlled (this is evidently, among other things, the peasantry's payoff for its political support of Big Business). (2) Declarations and forthcoming legislation of the antitrust variety specifically authorize

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

what the *New York Times* in a Paris dispatch of December 10th calls "ententes and agreements among competitors . . . serving a useful economic purpose" (useful for guess whom). And (3) a good deal of "planning" of a kind to further the interests of Big Business, along lines especially pioneered in France in recent years, is contemplated (an example is the "Europort" project for a big harbor and industrial center opposite the Hook of Holland). All in all, it is clear that the founders of the Common Market mean by "free competition" just what Standard Oil and General Motors and U.S. Steel mean: freedom for Big (and for the most part monopolistic) Business to make maximum profits, with the government taking over or helping out as and when needed.

This is of course in no way surprising. But it would be wrong to assume that the guaranteeing of this principle in all the basic statutes of the Common Market is a mere ritual. On the contrary, if the structure of the Common Market is taken into account, it will be seen that what is really being guaranteed is capitalism itself. When the organization is fully functioning, legislation in most areas of economic policy will be the responsibility of the new supranational "government" rather than of the individual member states. Decisions will be binding on all members if passed by a majority of 12 out of 17 votes, with France and Italy and West Germany having four votes apiece, Belgium and the Netherlands two each, and Luxemburg one. The other side of the coin is that no measure will pass if opposed by six votes, i.e. one major and one minor state (other than Luxemburg). With "free competition" and all that it implies forming an essential part of the original framework of the organization, this evidently means that any basic reforms of a socialist character will be able to be blocked by just two of the member states. Thus all the machinery for curbing and controlling a future revolutionary movement in, say, France or Italy or both at the same time, is already in place. Further, if Britain enters the Common Market, as the present Tory government is proposing, she too will be placing herself in a capitalist straitjacket with the draw strings in the hands of others. What will then be left of the Fabian theory that, whatever may be true of other countries with different historical backgrounds, British

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

democracy offers the possibility of a gradual and peaceful transition to the new social order of planning and production for use? Have we perhaps here hit upon one of the fundamental reasons why all the ruling classes of Western Europe show so little regret or compunction about discarding the national sovereignty which was once their proudest and most jealously guarded possession?

Let us turn now to another aspect of the Common Market. When the Rome Treaty was signed (1957), France won a special place for her African colonies; and subsequently when they became independent, all but Guinea elected to remain in the Common Market as "Associated States." In effect, the relations which existed between France and her ex-colonies have now been generalized to apply to the Common Market as a whole and the Associated States. The *quid* is a privileged position for the tropical and mineral products of the Associated States in the European market, the *quo* a privileged position for Common Market manufactures in the Associated States. In addition a Common Market "Development Fund" is provided for. At first this Fund showed a disposition to assist the Associated States in such matters as education and health, but more recently the emphasis has shifted sharply toward "productive" investments, meaning of course investments designed to enhance the capacity of the recipients to supply raw materials needed by the Common Market. If and when Britain joins the Common Market, the status of Associated States will presumably be open to her African colonies and former colonies, though how many, if indeed any, are anxious to join is by no means clear. However that may be, there can be no doubt that the Common Market is doing its best to foster a system of neocolonialism in Africa, not dissimilar in content to that which the United States has built up in Latin America in the course of the last 75 years or so.

So far the economic importance of the Common Market's neocolonialism has not been great, and there is a possibility that it never will be: after all, this is no longer the 19th century. On the other hand, the danger is by no means negligible, and already the division of the newly independent African states into Common Market Associates and others has done tremendous damage to the cause of African unity and progress.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is no wonder that genuine African leaders, as distinct from the lackeyized holdovers from the colonial past, regard the Common Market with the deepest suspicion and hostility. As the Bombay *Economic Weekly* put it in a recent (September 16th) dispatch from Accra:

> President Nkrumah rightly considers the Common Market as an attempt to make permanent the division between the wealthy countries and the "hewers of wood and drawers of water." For him, as for many other Africans, the Rome Treaty. . .signified not an advance towards economic development, but an attempt to establish a collective imperialism of the West European countries. This is a portent, not only for Africa but for all ex-colonial and underdeveloped countries. Where is the guarantee that if the European countries re-establish their economic hegemony over Africa, they will not attempt to do so elsewhere? Europe does protest too much the innocence of its political motives in Africa.

So much for the general character and aims of the Common Market as it has taken shape to date. Certain consequences and further developments are either already occurring or would appear to be reasonably predictable:

(1) As internal tariffs have gone down in favor of an emerging common tariff wall, trade among the Six has grown considerably more rapidly than trade between the Common Market as a whole and the rest of the world. In other words, producers within the Common Market area have, as intended, been the special beneficiaries of the new trading patterns. This of course explains the recent stampede of America's corporate giants to establish or expand European branches. It also goes far toward explaining the investment boom which Western Europe has enjoyed during the last few years and which has been the chief support of that area's prosperity and rapid economic growth. With the tariff readjustment process still having several years to run, this investment boom may well continue for some time yet. Since it comes on top of a postwar reconstruction boom, the result has already been what is in many ways an unprecedentedly long period of capitalist expansion. It is not surprising, therefore, that the illusion is by now widespread that the Common Market has somehow discovered the long-sought secret of permanent (capitalist) pros-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perity.* And this illusion, as has happened repeatedly in the history of capitalism, has become a more or less independent factor spurring on the boom and inciting the greedy capitalists to build up the excess capacity which will sooner or later bring it to an end.

(2) An uninhibited process of capital accumulation such as is now under way in the Common Market always leads to two types of concentration. (a) Geographical concentration in the already more developed areas where transport, services, specialized supply industries, skilled labor, etc., are readily available. It is therefore only natural that the prosperity produced by the Common Market is very unevenly distributed, being centered in such areas as the lower Rhine Valley and northern Italy and largely by-passing the backward areas (which need it most) of southern Germany, southern France, and southern Italy. The institutions established by the Treaty of Rome which are supposed to correct this imbalance (Development Bank and Social Fund) are largely irrelevant. The Development Bank is bound by its charter to act on commercial principles (in this respect it is like the World Bank), and can therefore accomplish little that private enterprise wouldn't sooner or later be willing to undertake on its own initiative. And the Social Fund is concerned not with developing the backward areas but with training and moving workers out of them to meet the growing manpower requirements of the more advanced areas. (b) The expansion in the size of markets, both through tariff elimination

* The relevant literature abounds with statements like the following: "In this respect [the rate of economic growth], the performance of the Common Market has been much more satisfactory than that of the United States; indeed, its rate of economic growth has been double that of the United States in recent years. Moreover, it seems reasonably certain that growth will continue at a high rate in the enlarged Common Market. . . . The major uncertainty is not that the enlarged Common Market might fail to grow at an adequate rate, but that the United States would continue to be deficient in this basic respect." (Robert R. Bowie and Theodore Geiger, *The European Economic Community and the United States,* Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee, Washington, 1961, p. 38.) This study, available from the Government Printing Office for 25 cents, contains a useful summary of information on the Common Market as well as a statement of the official line on the policy implications for the United States. Naturally it shows little understanding of the real nature of the Common Market.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and through economic growth, favors Big Business as against its smaller rivals. The great combines, whether of native European or American provenance, are therefore the chief beneficiaries of the Common Market. When all the returns are in some years hence, no one should be surprised to discover that Western Europe has been through an industrial concentration process comparable in intensity to that which the United States experienced during the 1890's. In the meanwhile, the study by Bowie and Geiger referred to above reports that "the Common Market has greatly stimulated arrangements among firms within the Community, especially across national boundaries," and refers to this development as a "spectacular growth of industrial associations of all shapes and sizes." (P. 19.)

(3) The Common Market is still in its early stages of development, and the degree of political unification involved is still not great. For the most part the individual members are acting along parallel lines without yet having renounced the sovereign right to act differently if they so choose. This situation, however, is changing, and we have no doubt that the direction, though not necessarily the speed, of change is now irreversible. As economic integration proceeds, voluntary coordination of policies will become increasingly cumbersome and unworkable; ever widening powers of decision will have to be turned over to the new "supranational" agencies. And at some stage in this process of accumulating power, these agencies will inevitably be transformed into the effective government of a new state: from being supranational they will progress to a new and higher level of nationality. Needless to say, this is the goal of many, though not all, supporters of the Common Market: they see it not as an end but as a means to the creation of a new great power which will be able to take its place in the world alongside the United States and the Soviet Union. But it matters little whether this is a consciously sought objective; it is in any case the logical outcome of the course to which the six countries forming the Common Market have committed themselves. In the absence of some unexpected upheaval, there is every reason to assume that it will be substantially realized during the decade of the 1960's.

What all this means is that there is now shaping up in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Western Europe a new capitalist-imperialist power having a population and economic potential quite comparable to that of the United States,* and it is with this reality that the Kennedy administration is preparing to cope. The question which then arises is: what sort of relations are likely to develop between the two capitalist superpowers?

If this question had arisen 50 years ago, it would have been relatively easy to answer. One could have looked forward confidently to an all-out struggle for world supremacy, beginning with a trade war, extending to a competitive grab for colonies and spheres of influence, and ending in armed conflict. In this context, the Kennedy administration's request for tariff-cutting powers would have been seen not as a move toward genuinely freer trade but simply as a request for a bargaining weapon with which to fight the trade war more effectively. And of course no one with any sophistication would have taken seriously all the talk about the necessity for cooperation and partnership with the new rival. After all, such slogans have always been the stock-in-trade of imperialist propagandists.

Nowadays, however, the existence of the socialist world complicates matters. Not that rivalry between the two capitalist superpowers has ceased. On the contrary, it still exists and will doubtless become more intense. The Six increased their share of world trade from 16 percent in 1950 to 26 percent in 1960, while in the same period the share of the United States remained stationary at 17 percent. This disparity is likely to grow, for two reasons: first, because U.S. exports will meet increasingly severe competition within the Common Market itself; and second, because European producers with a larger domestic market to supply should be able to lower their costs and hence to penetrate more successfully American and other foreign markets. With Japanese exports showing a similar upward trend, American trade prospects can hardly be described as bright, and it is of course this situation which Mr. Kennedy's new legislative proposals are intended to remedy. Moreover,

* If Britain joins, the comparison will be that much more favorable to the new power. However, for many reasons—some of which are set forth in Mr. Zilliacus's article elsewhere in this issue—we think it is much too soon to take Britain's joining for granted.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there can be no doubt about the somewhat less than brotherly spirit with which American Big Business is approaching what it regards as an inevitable showdown with the Common Market on trade and financial matters. This spirit was well expressed in testimony on December 11th before a Congressional Committee by Mr. Theodore V. Houser, vice chairman for foreign economic policy of the Big Business-supported Committee for Economic Development. According to the next day's report in the *New York Times,* Mr. Houser told the Committee that

the goal of any negotiations with the Common Market should be "to attain a substantially greater degree of liberalization of their commercial policy than we give in return."

He said that in the ten years after World War II the United States made substantially greater "effective reductions" in its tariff barriers than Europe conceded to this country.

United States negotiators also should see to it, Mr. Houser said, that protective European quotas were not substituted for tariffs and that excise taxes not be applied so as to hinder imports from the United States. He added that care should be taken that no impediments be imposed on convertibility of earned currency for repatriation here.

Mr. Houser. . .suggested that Congress write "a new escape clause" permitting withdrawal of negotiated tariff concessions "where unforeseen serious hardship arises" as a result of imports.

One might be forgiven for thinking that with an attitude like this it would be easier to precipitate a trade war than to work out an amicable agreement for economic cooperation. And indeed such would doubtless be the outcome were it not for the firm conviction on both sides that the preservation of capitalism (alias the "free world") demands a united front of the two great imperialist powers. To struggle for supremacy comes as naturally to capitalism as swimming to a duck. And yet a stage has now been reached in which the only beneficiary of capitalist struggle may be socialism. "Two souls, alas, do dwell within his breast; the one is ever parting from the other."

The emergence of a great unified European imperialist power poses this latter-day capitalist dilemma in its most acute form. Will the United States and the Common Market enter into a long and costly struggle, as evenly matched capitalist

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rivals always have in the past? Or will they join together in a united front to oppose the further advance of socialism?

It will probably be some time before we will be able to answer these questions with any assurance. In the meantime, those who may feel inclined to prejudge the case would do well to keep the following in mind: The United States now feels itself to be in the "down" position, and the indications are (see Mr. Houser's testimony quoted above as an example) that it is planning to make stiff demands on the Common Market, citing in justification the importance of a healthy American economy in the larger struggle against socialism. As long as the Common Market is expanding rapidly and enjoying a large and continuous export surplus, it can afford to make concessions and very likely will do so. But let the Common Market fall into the kind of stagnation that prevails in this country today and that is prevented from turning into outright economic collapse only by mounting unproductive expenditures on armaments—let the Common Market fall into such a situation and the whole outlook will change. Then we shall have a crucial test, not of capitalism's *will* but of its *ability* to oppose a united front to the forward march of socialism.

(December 12, 1961)

In the new Common Market we shall be facing a very formidable competitor with a faster rate of growth, with an enormous internal market and with a highly efficient capacity to export. We shall be facing not only a competition which is formidable but the likelihood of deep difficulties in our balance of payments. If we do not take strong measures at home and abroad, we may well find ourselves in an extremely difficult decade.

As the realities become visible to us, we shall find that we must reappraise assumptions which this generation of Americans have become used to taking for granted. Primarily, there is the assumption that in our relations with Europe we are the givers and they are the receivers, that it depends on us, therefore, how little or how much we shall participate in the affairs of Europe. This assumption is ceasing to be valid as Western Europe, with its amazingly rapid economic growth, draws closely together towards economic and political union.

—*Walter Lippmann, New York Herald Tribune, November 16, 1961*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BRITAIN AND THE COMMON MARKET

BY KONNI ZILLIACUS

The European Economic Community, generally known as the Common Market, was founded nearly five years ago. What it is and stands for cannot be understood without reference to its origins. Nor can the decision of the British Tory government to apply for admission now, after holding aloof for all these years—although it would have been much easier and more advantageous to go in on the ground floor when the situation was fluid and Britain's accession was regarded as well-nigh essential —be understood without considering Britain's relationship to the United States.

For the Common Market is the child of NATO and the European Recovery Program (Marshall Plan). Uncle Sam was the founding father of both, has kept the young couple going, and is taking an almost paternal interest in their offspring. As for Britain's application for entry, the cartoonist Vicki was, as usual, close to the bone in his cartoon depicting Macmillan as a somewhat careworn old roué with a blousy Europa in a bride's veil on his arm, looking anxiously over his shoulder at a juvenile President Kennedy in a Davy Crockett cap driving him to the altar with a shotgun.

America's overriding postwar purpose was described by President Truman in his famous message to Congress of March 5th, 1947, as follows:

> There is one thing that the Americans value more than peace. It is freedom. Freedom of worship, freedom of speech, and freedom of enterprise. The pattern of international trade which is most conducive to freedom of enterprise is one in which major decisions are made, not by governments but by private buyers and sellers. . . the pattern of trade which is least conducive to freedom of enterprise is one in which decisions are made by governments. . . . Unless we act and act decisively, it will be the pattern of the next century.

A Labor M.P. and a distinguished specialist in international affairs, **Konni Zilliacus is the author of MR Press book, *A New Birth of Freedom?***

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ERP and NATO launched policies intended to give effect to this purpose. George F. Kennan, in his broadcast Reith Lectures in Britain in November and December of 1959, described how NATO was intended to hold off "Communistic expansion" (which in the minds of the initiators and supporters of this policy means any form of socialism), while ERP with the help of American capital revived and consolidated "free enterprise" economies in Europe. At the time this policy was being put in hand, and ten years before Mr. Kennan described its nature in the gentler terms fit for British ears, Joseph Alsop in the *New York Herald Tribune* had quoted an American administrator of ERP, who summed up its object more pithily and pungently as being "back to 1911 by 1952."

From the start, the restoration of the old social order in Italy, West Germany, France, and the Lowlands had been due to American diplomatic, financial, and even the threat of military intervention, and was closely connected with the formation of NATO and the policy of the Cold War. The allies and clients of this policy were the forces of the Right in the six countries—Belgium, Holland, Luxemburg, France, West Germany, and Italy—which in 1951 established the Coal and Steel Community, pooling their coal and steel industries under a supranational authority, which gave statutory form to the great interlocking trusts, combines, and monopolies, with Germany as the dominant partner and American capital in the background.

In March, 1957, the six countries, after long negotiations conducted by men who identified the national interest with the interests of the giant interlocking trusts which by that time were in control of most of their economic life, signed the Treaty of Rome. It established a customs union among them through the progressive abolition of mutual tariffs and establishment of a common tariff against the rest of the world. It also established a European Economic Community for "progressively approximating the economic policies of Member States." (Article 2.) The preamble to the Rome Treaty says that the signatory states are "determined to establish the foundations of an ever closer union among the European peoples." Article 237 leaves it open to any European state to apply for admission, on condi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions to be determined unanimously by the Six. There is also provision in Article 238 for Associate Membership.

The Treaty provides that after a certain interim period, labor and capital are to be free to move from one Common Market country to another. Article 92 states: "Any aid granted by a Member State, or granted by means of State resources in any manner whatsover, which distorts or threatens to distort competition by favoring certain enterprises or certain productions shall, to the extent to which it adversely affects trade between Member States, be deemed to be incompatible with the Common Market."

Taken together these provisions, as Harold Wilson, Labor's present shadow Foreign Minister, pointed out in a recent debate on the subject in the House, would make impossible even the modest amount of public ownership and planning provided for in Labor's domestic policy program "Signposts for the Sixties" adopted at Blackpool in October, 1961. Indeed, he said it would make virtually impossible even the minimum amount of planning which a Conservative government might feel constrained to attempt through exchange controls, control over capital movements, import controls, and bank rate.

The European Economic Community consists of three supranational bodies, (the Coal and Steel High Authority, the Common Market Commission, and the Euratom Commission) which, unlike government departments in a national state, have the power of initiative and action, although nominally dependent on the Council of Ministers of the Common Market states. These bodies are manned by technocrats recruited from the world of High Finance and Big Business.

In the Council, Germany, France and Italy have 4 votes each, Belgium and the Netherlands 2 votes each and Luxemburg 1 vote. Decisions binding on all six governments on Common Market matters can be taken by a two-thirds majority. (If Britain entered, she would presumably also get 4 votes and Denmark and Norway, who say they would go in with Britain, would each have 2. But fascist Portugal has already announced that if Britain goes in, she does too. Greece may do the same, and it is the declared policy of the British Tory Government to integrate Franco Spain fully in Western Europe.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is also an Assembly with a similar voting system (36 votes each for the 3 biggest powers, 14 each for Belgium and the Netherlands, and 6 for Luxemburg). But its resolutions have only the force of recommendations; its members are supplied by the parliaments of the constituent states; and up to now, in order to keep out the Communists, who are still the biggest parties in Italy and France, the parliamentarians attending the EEC Assembly are hand picked by the ruling party whips, thus turning the Assembly into what Michael Foot has called a "seraglio of eunuchs."

On May 22, 1960, Professor Hallstein, who was Dr. Adenauer's Foreign Minister before he became President of the Common Market Commission, where German big business pretty well rules the roost, made a speech at Harvard in which he said:

> We are not in business to promote tariff preferences or to establish a discriminatory club, to form a large market to make us richer, or a trading bloc to further our commercial interest. We are not in business at all: we are in politics.

On July 18, 1961, the Heads of State of the six countries meeting at Bad Godesberg (where Chamberlain met Hitler and agreed on the Munich sell-out) issued a communiqué saying they had decided:

> (1) To give form and figure to the will for political unification which is already contained in the treaties founding the European Communities.
>
> (2) To hold at regular intervals meetings with the aim of comparing their views, harmonizing their policies, and reaching common conceptions, in order to further the political unification of Europe.
>
> (3) To order their Commission to submit to them proposals on ways and means which would make it possible to give a statutory character within the shortest time to the unification of their peoples.

The Common Market is in fact the economic underpinning of NATO. It represents an attempt to consolidate the old order in the capitalist rump of Europe. So far from uniting, it consolidates the division of Europe and perpetuates the war pre-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parations and Cold War, without which it could not survive in anything like its present form.

It is run by a gang of reactionary governments which are sworn enemies of socialism and whose attitude to democracy is ambivalent where it is not downright hostile. It is not in any sense a "third force," but an economic dependency, a political satellite, and a military bridgehead of the United States.

In his Address on Free Trade in 1848, Karl Marx remarked that "to call cosmopolitan exploitation universal brotherhood is an idea that can only be engendered in the brain of the bourgeoisie." But the idea of world free trade was noble and spacious and a tribute to the brotherhood of man compared to the idea of the NATO Common Market, which might be expressed in the slogan: "Bourgeoisie of some countries, unite! You have nothing but humanity to lose, and capitalism to save with hydrogen bombs."

In the Conservative Party, there is strong opposition to the idea of entering the Common Market on national sovereignty and Commonwealth grounds. But the bulk of the Party, at least in the House, is loyal to its leader and in any case puts entry into the Common Market, as a way of defending the old social order against the growing need for public ownership and planning, before either national independence or the Commonwealth. Anyway, the latter is today mostly colored, anti-colonial, and "neutralist," besides being ready to resort to large doses of socialism as the best way to catch up with the modern world, so that the most imperially minded Tories are those who have least use for the modern Commonwealth.

The right-wing Tory aristocrat, Lord Hinchingbrooke, who is so old fashioned that he is not afraid of socialism and believes Britain still is and should remain a first-class world power, opposes the Common Market. In the debate in the House of Commons on August 2 and 3, he denounced his own party colleagues because, he said, they would "rather see this country ruled by European bureaucracy than ruled by British socialism. The fear of nationalization, of loss of business enterprise and of over-taxation is such in the minds of many of my honorable friends that they think there is a nice easy escape route out of it into Europe." He added: "I do not believe that the Socialist

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Party is an alien philosophy that is trying to work an evil on our society."

But that, of course, is precisely what most Tories *do* believe, and they have been brought to the edge of panic by the country's increasing economic difficulties and the strength of organized labor. Hence Harold Wilson's indictment in the House on August 3rd:

> I do not think that honorable Members can deny for one minute that there are some who are anxious to get in with one reason only—to have a wages showdown, which they have not been able to have in the last four years. It is five years since the Prime Minister, when Chancellor, announced his restrictive policy and in collusion, I think, with the then Chairman of the National Employers' Federation, had a showdown on engineering wages. That was in 1956. That, of course, failed and ever since attempts to have a wage freeze and a wage showdown have not succeeded. There are some people. . . who resent that. One hears murmurings from time to time that we had better get into Europe so that we can have this showdown once and for all.

Wilson went on to say that the trouble with British industry today was lethargy and sloth:

> There is no more dangerous illusion than that *laissez faire* and the cold east wind will do the trick. Positive, purposive, economic planning will be needed, as we have frequently and recently stated. . . . If there is no fundamental change in our internal economic policies, what we are debating today is whether we shall be a backwater in Europe or a backwater outside Europe, and both are an equally dangerous position to occupy. . . .
>
> I have referred to the need for planning. I ask the government: how far, under the Treaty of Rome as it is, could we undertake the degree of centralized economic management that we on this side of the House feel is needed? . . . As I read the Treaty of Rome, and the intentions of those who at present operate it, the measures necessary to fulfil the policies set out, for example, in "Signposts for the Sixties," cannot be implemented without substantial amendments to the relevant articles of the Treaty.

Wilson then referred to the pressure of European and American bankers, who had made the wage pause and entry into the Common Market the condition for granting to the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British government the £700-million loan it had asked for from the International Monetary Fund.

The United States government, he said, had made it plain that in their view "Britain must retire from the task of organizing summits" and instead go into the Common Market in order to help strengthen and consolidate Western Europe and NATO. Wilson pointed out that this would virtually mean the breakup of the Commonwealth, since instead of enjoying preference on the British market, Commonwealth goods would now be faced with the Common Market tariff, whereas Common Market goods would come free into Britain. But Britain does four times as much trade with the Commonwealth as with the Common Market.

Moreover, said Wilson, the Prime Minister had made it clear that his main motive in entering the Common Market was political. He did not quite use the phrase "a holy war against Communism," but that view was sticking out from a lot of what he had said about Britain's reasons for applying to enter the Common Market. But, concluded Mr. Wilson, "we have a role to play in the world, perhaps a decisive role at some historic moment, in building a bridge between East and West—between America and Russia, perhaps America and China—and we must search our hearts and ask whether going in or not going in will best help in that role."

In his first major prounouncement as Labor's new shadow Foreign Secretary, Mr. Wilson followed this up by saying of the Common Market:

> There are many signs of a desire to erect an arid and sterile tight trading and defensive bloc whose main intent appears and ends in the desire to present a Cold War front to the East. Britain must get close to Europe but not at the price of giving up our window opening on the new and exciting world which is appearing as a result of creating newly independent countries in Africa and Asia.
>
> I have warned of the danger not only to Britain but to the world if we are forced into a common policy identifying us with the French policy in Algeria and German obstructionism over Berlin.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These are the reasons why the Labor Party is moving into full opposition to the idea of Britain's entering the Common Market, and why Tory objections are becoming stronger as it becomes plain that the government's talk about safeguarding the interests of the Commonwealth or British agriculture are mere window-dressing, and that its real policy is pretty close to unconditional surrender, including acceptance of the political aims of the Common Market leaders, Adenauer and de Gaulle.

The Left in the Labor Party has of course been strongly opposed from the start and has gone farthest in propounding an alternative policy, which consists broadly in:

(1) Bringing up to date the 30 year old Ottawa imperial preferences Agreements, linking them with the European Free Trade Association Agreement, and tying both to a peace policy which would start with the next Labor government tabling proposals for settlement in Europe and Asia. These proposals would include: winding up the rival alliances and substituting an all-European collective security treaty based on the United Nations Charter, as an integral part of a policy of disengagement and disarmament; the neutralisation of West Berlin and making it the headquarters of part or all of the United Nations; the unification of Germany by stages, outside the rival alliances but inside the United Nations and the all-European collective security treaty; similar arrangements superseding CENTO and SEATO in the Middle and Far East.

(2) If the Soviet Union agreed and our allies refused to negotiate on these proposals, the Labor government would serve notice that since NATO, CENTO, and SEATO may be invoked only in cases of "unprovoked aggression," any ally who refused to agree with us on how to make peace and subsequently got into trouble by pursuing policies we regarded as dangerous and provocative, could not in the view of the British government legitimately claim to be a victim of "unprovoked aggression," and therefore could not count on British assistance.

As the Charter is the only treaty whose obligations are binding on all the members of the Commonwealth, this policy could unite the whole Commonwealth as a force for peace. The economic corollary to it would be to go in for developing trade

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and investment, interlocking of national economic plans, etc., throughout the Commonwealth and EFTA areas, and for developing East-West trade and cooperation in giving economic and technical aid to underdeveloped territories everywhere, using for this purpose the "universalist" economic machinery of the United Nations such as the Economic Commission for Europe and similar bodies for Africa, Latin America, the Middle and Far East.

Ultimately, these policies could only work with U.S. cooperation. But if British obstruction and opposition hastened the failure and collapse of the present Cold War policies, there should be enough people in the states not mentally or morally deficient or fanaticized to the point of preferring suicide to peaceful co-existence, who would insist, on enlightened self-interest grounds, on U.S. official policy becoming civilized.

LONDON—An electricity sub-station "somewhere in the provinces" broke down.

A telephone robot's job when this happens is to dial operator and say: "There is a fault at this power station. Please send repair men."

When the fault developed, the robot alertly dialed "O" for operator. Nobdy had told him the operator's number has been changed to "100."

So all he got was the second robot saying: "You no longer dial "O" for operator. Please replace your receiver and dial 100."

"For all I know they went on and on like that for hours," said the editor of the general post office's monthly, *The Telephonist*. "Like statesmen at a peace conference—and with about the same effect."

Toronto Star, December 5, 1961

Statesmen at work.

Today, every inhabitant of this planet must contemplate the day when it may no longer be habitable. Every man, woman and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident, miscalculation or madness. The weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us. . . . Mankind must put an end to war—or war will put an end to mankind.

—President John F. Kennedy, September, 1961

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TWO REPORTS FROM CUBA

BY SPECIAL CORRESPONDENTS

Every day the American press carries reports of new maneuverings, both inside and outside the Organization of American States, against revolutionary Cuba. But it has virtually ceased to report on what is happening inside Cuba itself: even the river of falsehood and distortion which once flowed so freely has now dried up. Under these circumstances, we think it is important to publish from time to time some of the reports which are continuously reaching us from persons in Cuba who are in a position to know what is going on. Each of the following communications was written by an American who is now working in Havana.—The Editors.

I

The counter-revolutionaries are less effective than at any time since I arrived. Bombings occur only about once or twice a month. (Compare this with the situation in Paris.) Recently a leader of Manuel Ray's underground movement in Cuba was captured and, before TV, related the divisions among the opposition movements, their frequent failures, their growing discouragement in the face of solid popular support for the government and the efficiency of the Committees for the Defense of the Revolution. He concluded by urging all his companions to give up the fight and return to their families. Their activities no longer had any prospect of success. Only an American-supported invasion from outside could overthrow the government, and he wanted nothing to do with that. I think virtually everybody in Cuba would agree with his statement: "This government can never be overthrown from within." I frequently talk to the counter-revolutionaries still left in our building and find them, too, reduced strictly to hopes of drastic action by the U.S. government.

Will that be forthcoming? You in the States are in a better position to judge than I. The government here seems to be genuinely alarmed and passes out new warnings almost daily. I find myself discounting these. There is so little support from the OAS and so much danger of popular uprisings all over South America in response to another invasion that the State

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Department must see the negative aspects in such a move. On the other hand, Kennedy's threat to land the marines in the Dominican Republic was an ominous symptom of his dangerous state of impatience. Balaguer is nothing more than an heir to the Trujillo regime, just as unpopular as his predecessor. The threatened intervention is really not aimed at the right as Rusk feigned but at the left, at the Dominican pro-Castro forces, which seem to be strong enough to pose a real threat. An intervention there could be a prelude to action in Cuba. Also, Sulzberger's articles in the *Times* written from various South American capitals, more or less openly calling for an American intervention with force as the only way out of a bad situation, will strengthen the hand of the bold, direct action advocates. Still, I trust there will be enough division on the question and enough opposition from Britain and Canada to keep the government from acting decisively.

The last year has been used most impressively in tasks of organization and education. The literacy campaign is producing historic results. The only illiterates left will be over 55 years of age and a few *burros* who have refused to be persuaded to accept instruction. These will be used by the State Department lawyers and the Voice of America to prove the campaign a failure. Fidel said recently: "We will not force anyone to learn against his will. We promised the world to educate illiterates, not *burros*. In a few months an illiterate will be looked at with suspicion. 'Could he be a counter-revolutionary? Could he be a *burro?*' " This speech undoubtedly further reduced the remnant of opposition. I saw its effects in the collapse of resistance in the last of the employees in my apartment house to hold out against the pressure. He is now being "alphabetized" at forced pace in order to redeem the honor of the rest of the working force, who but for him would already be flying the banner of "Free from Illiteracy." You can imagine the social pressure on these diehards. There is now an exciting race among all the towns of Cuba, with returns reported daily in the newspapers, to avoid the disgrace of "La peste al ultimo," the Cuban version of "Last one in is a rotten egg." Everyone feels a tremendous satisfaction and good humor at the results of this campaign. Eighty-nine thousand teen-agers went into the coun-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tryside. They were reinforced in the last months by 19,000 workers, who also went into the most difficult and remote corners. Some of these people taught as many as fifteen to twenty illiterates to read and write. They are receiving heroes' honors, never more deserved.

There are still food shortages and grumbling lines at the grocery stores. The grumbling is mainly directed against the chiselers, who buy in several stores, and at the lack of organization in the distribution system. These complaints, by no means confined to the counter-revolutionaries, are causing more attention to be given to distribution procedures, so that there is a visible improvement from week to week in this important sector. The government was slow to bring pressure on the petty bourgeois owners of food stores, who were content to sell their wares to the first customers and resisted the trouble and responsibility of rationing. Also, since Cuba now produces more food than ever before, Fidel thought the problem would solve itself (except in the case of lard, where he knew there would be a delay of 18 months and so immediately established a rationing system that has functioned well). In time the shortages will disappear, but people do not find in this prospect an adequate answer to the problem of buying meat, potatoes, and toothpaste *this week*. Troubles are mainly due to increased consumption and collapse of the old distribution systems, with departure of profiteering intermediaries. The Ministry of Internal Commerce, charged with the task of organizing distribution, has concentrated first on supplying the numerous state enterprises such as schools and the army, leaving the remainder to wholesale produce markets where private entrepreneurs do their buying. They have frequently found nothing or little to buy in some of their customary items. This puts the public in a hoarding mood, making it hard to restore and maintain normal stocks. Hours of waiting in line in crowded grocery stores is still a daily, petty grievance. Naturally the counter-revolutionaries spend these hours talking very loudly about what a mess the country is in "since the government started sending everything to the Communist countries."

The political reorganization is going forward. The Cuban Communist Party (PSP) has been dissolved; and the campaign to train cadres of Marxist-Leninists for the new party has been

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a priority enterprise since January. Blas Roca returned recently from a long stay in the Soviet Union. In his first speech he reiterated that he is no longer Secretary General of the PSP, because there is no PSP. There is only the Organizaciones Revolucionarias Integradas, soon to become the Partido Unido de la Revolucion Socialista, of which Fidel Castro is Secretary General. He declared that Fidel is the best man around to lead the Cubans in the construction of socialism and later of communism. Unity seems strong as a rock. The Eleventh Trade Union Congress, just concluded, produced no sour notes, no echos of the Tenth Congress, where David Salvador succeeded in excluding the Communists from participation in a unity slate. This was the Congress (early 1960) where Fidel said he had arms for workers but feared that the trade unionists would use them against each other. All this is ancient history. Marxism-Leninism is now fully incorporated into the ideology of the Revolution and is promoted with the same enthusiasm that a year ago was whooping it up for the 26th of July. The Eastern European Communists who are here look on with envy. The *Internationale* is sung more frequently than the 26th of July March.

There is still nothing spectacular to report in the realm of industrialization. An American industrial engineer who works in the Planning Commission, says that things are going very well and that within a few years Cuba will be a showplace. All necessary factors are available, and the socialist countries are determined to make it so. The imponderable is United States harassment.

II

After seven months, we still have stars in our eyes about this place—the freedom, the democracy, the dignity of people, and the devotion to the goals of a new way of life of human brotherhood shine as brightly as ever. True, we have seen opportunism, ignorance, confusion, human frailty, and frustrating inefficiencies. But when one sits back and views the seven months, one is astounded by the progress. Batting down all obstacles is this great devotion—this great spirit of cooperation.

We have no fear that a serious blow by armed forces will

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

destroy socialism in Cuba. The Cubans take to a socialist society with great naturalness and simplicity. One of our wealthy neighbors who has absorbed the spirit of this new society said, "I used to think that money was important but now I find happiness in work which I believe is useful and creative." The *humildes* who drill day and night in the streets will not give up their new dignity lightly. What we fear, and what distresses us, is that a serious invasion threat will foster hatreds that will take a long time to heal. It pains us that these hatreds will be more and more bitterly directed against the country that we love. And, too, a serious threat may breed intolerance; fears may lead weak people to waver; the government here may be forced to take strong measures against dissidents (distinct from counter-revolutionaries) who today have complete freedom. Then, even in victory, socialism could be pointed at as a form of police state.

Americans might say: "What's the difference? That's what we're told now." But not so the rest of the world. This is probably the most visited place on earth. Tens of thousands of foreigners have seen Fidel arguing the merits of "free enterprise" over TV with mercenaries fresh from the battlefield. They have viewed the same sort of debate in a big convention of doctors where Fidel just said, "You're entitled to your opinions, and we'll get along fine so long as you live up to your oath of curing the sick and don't work to destroy the Revolution." Foreigners here have seen the wealthy who have stayed in their mansions and fine apartments still driving about in their chauffered limousines. They know that in three short years, Cubans who never wore shoes before, who never lived in an adequate dwelling, never had adequate clothing, nor knew how to read and write, have gotten all these things.

Here in Havana, in the great mansions which were abandoned, thousands of girls from the countryside are going to school learning hygiene, dietetics, dress making, etc. They will be the future teachers of the backward areas where people have lived in *bohios* on a diet of sugar and bananas. When we go out in the evening, we see classes in progress everywhere. Every mansion, every public building or hall is a school; classes are held in factories and homes. And the people are learning not

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only skills and techniques but how to live constructively in a "we" instead of an "I" society.

As to economic progress here, it is substantial but uneven. We have problems in that all the leadership at every level does not match the quality of the top leadership. In almost all cases, the leadership is most inexperienced. The best situation exists where the leaders are not afraid to admit they don't know. Then they search for advice from foreign experts and, what is more important, from their subordinates and the workers. However, there are cases where those with much confidence and a gift for talking get themselves important positions. Such leaders, either out of "know-it-all" egotism or fear of showing their ignorance, fail to consult with their subordinates. Of course, they show their ignorance by issuing ridiculous orders which have no relation to reality. These orders act as straitjackets upon those who are trying to do a practical job. In my own job I see the results of both types of leadership. Where the leadership is humble and democratic, the industry surges ahead overcoming all obstacles; where bureaucratic leadership exists, one sees wonderful people batting their brains out trying to do a job and making little progress.

Upon traveling through the country, one sees the same uneven development. Some towns are clean and neat with newly painted houses, new recreation centers, new sewer projects, etc., with everyone bustling. Other towns are dirty, infested with mosquitos and flies, with thousands of men sitting around idle on a work day. I should add that the last time I visited a town fitting the latter description, the mosquitos were gone thanks to government control measures, but the other ills remained. And, above all, it is clear that the bustling, clean, progressive communities represent the new Cuba; the drab and backward community is the child of the past.

However, a social scientist could conduct a fruitful research project uncovering why one factory or one community reacts quickly to the opportunities opened by socialism and why another continues along its slovenly, unproductive, and ignorant path. Needless to say, each factory, each state farm, and each community that achieves the take-off into self-sustained growth frees meager government forces to concentrate on the weak spots.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lately, we have been viewing ceremonies celebrating the completion of the literacy campaign in certain communities. The campaign has involved (1) a period of census taking, (2) a period of providing a teacher for each illiterate, and (3) a period of teaching. At each step, some illiterates have been dropped from the program. First, a few evaded all efforts of the census takers. Then, some absolutely refused to accept a teacher. Finally, some of the aged, ill, or seriously deprived, found it impossible to learn.

In all drop-out groups, I am sure that there were many who might have learned, had skilled psychologists and talented teachers been available. But, the remarkable fact is that the communities completing their tasks are able to report 80 percent of all illiterates can now read and write. One must see the deprived sections of Cuba to realize the immensity of this achievement. In these deprived areas, I feel like a giant. The people average less than my shoulder height. They are emaciated and old-looking before their time. Their diet is terrible—loaded with sugar and animal fats. I often wonder how many incipient and actual diabetics there are in this country. Incidentally, the Ministry of Public Health has down-to-earth leadership which is doing a terrific job, and Fidel seems to have won over a large section of the doctors who have remained here.

In order to evaluate what you may hear about Cuba, we note a few habit patterns of life here:

(1) *Punctuality*: In our Spanish language book, an American complains about someone not keeping an appointment. The Latin American answers: "We are very informal. We intend to come at the agreed hour but something comes up and we decide to do something else." We have invited Latin Americans for dinner. Some arrive very late without apology. Others never arrive. When you see them a couple of days later, there is no reference to the missed engagement. You can draw your own conclusions as to how such a pattern fits with a coordinated industrial society or even with such a task as raising chickens on a mass scale.

(2) *Attitude toward manual work*: The Cuban can understand a professional going into the mountains to fight for liberty.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But he has no comprehension of a college-trained person working at a trade or in a factory. The Americans here who have had this experience have stopped trying to explain. Volunteer work in the cane fields or at the docks does not bridge the great gap which exists between manual and white collar labor here.

(3) *Bureaucracy and red tape*: Under Batista, a government worker was seldom hired because a job needed to be done. A job was created whenever a cousin, nephew, or political crony needed a job. Under such circumstances, workers are very clever in devising schemes where they look busy and necessary. We noted this system at work in Mexico where over fifteen people had something to do (visibly) with getting two trunks through customs, and all had to get a tip. Actually, of course, this system develops when a government is unpopular. It is a way of providing some basis of support—some vested interest in the status quo. It is only different in degree from the way county jobs are handed out in the U.S. But, of course, not all people trained in clerical work under such a system give up their habit patterns in a system that aims at being productive.

(4) *Professional attachment to the old way of life.* In addition to the divorcement from the working class and peasantry, a large portion of the professionals got their schooling in U.S. universities and worked for either the Batista government or for U.S. firms. The *campesinos* had no money, so almost all doctors practiced in Havana or other larger cities and were dependent upon the upper and middle classes for their living.

One could add other characteristics such as the Cuban propensity to talk and argue, with everybody talking at once. We have seen meetings called for a purpose disintegrate into everyone talking at once and breaking up without ever being called to order or reaching any conclusions. Add also the fact that hundreds of thousands of people are handling responsibilities for which they have had neither training nor experience. For instance, I am working at a job that should be held by a mechanical engineer who is fluent in Spanish. So, if you read that Cuba has a few difficulties, think only how wonderful it would be if the many skilled workers who are unemployed

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the U.S. today could help in this great adventure in co-operative living.

Outwardly, the face of Havana has not changed much since we arrived and perhaps little since the revolution. Now, almost all the crude signs "Death to Batista" on the walls have been hidden under coats of fresh paint. But the neon signs still brighten the city. Instead of the old Buick sign, there is a flashing sign which blinks alternately "Patria o Muerte" and "Venceremos." The billboards educate against absenteeism, push the literacy program, say "Remember [in English] Playa Giron," or welcome some delegation or dignitary such as Yuri Gagarin.

The art work is superb and shows up not only in temporary and permanent signs but also in TV programs. The TV still has ads but no interruptions of plays, etc. The ads tell of new movies, special TV programs, 20,000 adult high school scholarships, or educate against spitting in public places. The TV has some very good plays (some a bit propagandistic like one involving Gary Powers and the U-2). News programs, including newsreels from all over the world, are our favorites. Most of the reportage is fairly objective. There are little digs, of course. Last night we saw Truman's visit to the Kennedys. It was explained that Truman was the man who needlessly used the atomic bombs on Japan.

We have been provoked by the teen-age sons of rich people here who used to write dirty slogans against Fidel in the elevators and break up patio furniture. But for two months we have had newly painted elevators without defacing. Also, last night I heard singing in the courtyard patio, looked out, and recognized some of our "delinquents." They were singing Cuban patriotic songs and the *Internationale*. A while back, signs appeared showing a beautiful child. They said: "This child can grow up to be a materialistic atheist or a true servant of God. It is up to you." Almost immediately, almost identical signs appeared saying: "This child can grow up to be a counter-revolutionary terrorist or a true patriot. It is up to you." This type of propaganda exchange has ebbed. An important leader of the counter-revolution was arrested recently and was interviewed by the press and over the radio and TV. He admitted contact with the CIA through the embassy of Venezuela and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

through Guantanamo, and involved 35 other persons in his confession. A while back, I recall Miami radio making a big thing out of a woman being executed here in Cuba. No mention was made that she was caught placing an incendiary bomb in the toy section of a Havana department store. This week, a funeral was held for a young Havana boy. Over six months ago, he went to the Escambray mountains to teach farmers how to read and write. Last Sunday was his 16th birthday. While teaching in the thatched hut of a farmer, a gang of counter-revolutionaries surrounded the hut demanding the "Communist teacher." The farmer, being a militiaman, tried to defend the boy but both were dragged out, tortured, and hung. The farmer left eight children. A huge crowd, stunned and angered, attended the funeral where they heard and approved a "war to the death" against the counter-revolutionaries.

The U.S. papers may have overlooked this item, but when the criminals are caught and receive their punishment, you probably will be told about the "Castro terror" in Cuba.

A revolution is not the same as inviting people to dinner, or writing an essay, or painting a picture, or doing fancy needlework; it cannot be anything so refined, so calm and gentle, or so mild, kind, courteous, restrained and magnanimous. A revolution is an uprising, an act of violence whereby one class overthrows another.

—*Mao Tse-Tung*

In an abundant society the problem is not an economic one of keeping the machine running regardless of what it puts out, but a political one of achieving the common good. And planning is one of its major means.

—*W. H. Ferry, The Dilemmas of Abundance, 1961*

In the councils of Government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes.

—*President Eisenhower, Farewell Address, January* 17, 1961

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE IN THE USSR

BY ALICE RICHARDS

The following is the somewhat abridged text, transcribed from a tape recording, of an interview which Mrs. Richards had with Nina Orlova in Moscow during August, 1961. Nina Orlova is a Professor of Civil and International Private Law, a member of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, and a leading authority on the subject of marriage and divorce in the Soviet Union.—The Editors

Q. Mrs. Nina Orlova, we would like to ask you about marriage and family laws in the Soviet Union. Are there, for example, different and conflicting laws among the different Republics?

A. In the Soviet Union we have a Code of Law on marriage, family, and guardianship. We have different Codes of Law in the Union Republics, but the principles are very similar. They differ only in details.

Q. What would be some of the differences?

A. One would be, for instance, the rule that is in effect in the Ukraine Republic that a woman can marry at the age of 16. In most other Republics, the age for both men and women is 18.

Q. Are exceptions ever made to these laws?

A. They can get permission. Women are allowed to marry at 17 where there is some important reason.

Q. Are men or women required to have their parents' consent to marry?

A. No, it is not required because they are of full age at 18.

Q. If they marry below this age, is the parents' consent necessary?

A. No. Permission from the Executive Committee of the local district is what they need.

Q. When a couple in the Soviet Union decides to get married, what is the procedure?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A. They address themselves to the Bureau of Registration of Civil Acts which exists in every region, in cities, and in rural areas. They must come there to say they want to get married. The Bureau verifies their ages and that they are not already married. It is a useful procedure, for young people especially, for it gives them time to think over whether the marriage will work or not.

Q. *How long does it take from the time they apply?*

A. Usually, it takes one week—sometimes five or six days. In the Soviet Union only the civil marriage has legal status, but those who want to celebrate their marriage in church can, only the religious marriage has no legal force.

Q. *I understand this is true in Mexico and in some other countries, too. Are health examinations required for marriage?*

A. No, they are not. People must tell about the state of their health, but there is no medical examination. Of course, we have many physical examinations in schools and in institutes because people sometimes neglect their health.

Q. *I recently read a booklet which said the rate of marriage in the Soviet Union is unusually high (12.5 per 1000 population), one of the highest in the world. [I was referring to the booklet* Women in the USSR *which was published by the Foreign Languages Publishing House in Moscow in 1960.] How do you explain this?*

A. I think it is characteristic of our people. They are not afraid of their future and build their families when they meet the person with whom they want to be married. There are no economic questions that prevent them from marriage as soon as they feel they are sure of each other.

Q. *When people get married by civil registration, is there any ceremony?*

A. Yes, there is a ceremony which is not very complicated, but now we are trying to do it with more ceremony, because maybe it is better for young people when they have to remember all their lives the day of their marriage. As you know, in some cities there are special houses where marriages are celebrated and people are congratulated by a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

representative of the local Soviet, and there are flowers everywhere. They can invite their relatives and friends and music is played, but they also celebrate at home or at a restaurant or at the factory.

Q. We met one young couple who told us they celebrated for two days.

A. Yes, very often they do.

Q. Is it the custom in the Soviet Union for most women to stop work or school when they get married?

A. Most women continue their work. This is our aim—to give every woman the possibility to have a large family and to work. Of course, it depends on the facilities created for women who work. We have a large network of pre-school institutions for children—kindergartens and nurseries—where they can bring their children and take them back home in the evening or even sometimes at the end of the week. But, many familes prefer to have the mother stay home for a year with the baby and then they go back to work.

Q. What about her job?

A. A woman can have leave for a year after childbirth, and when she goes back to work she gets the same job as before. There are many privileges for women covered by law.

Q. Is she paid at any time during this period?

A. The paid leave is usually about 100 days, sometimes a little longer. It depends on the state of health of mother and child. The woman usually takes her annual paid vacation at this time and therefore has more than three months. In addition, during one year, she can have leave without pay. This is provided by law and it is a very great achievement to stop work for such a long time and not to be afraid of losing one's former job.

Q. Is birth control legal in the Soviet Union, and if so how do women find out how to postpone having children?

A. Birth control is legal in our country. If a woman is not inclined to have children for some time she can get information from a doctor in any medical institution or clinic. She can get aid.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Q. I understand that abortion is also legalized in the Soviet Union. Can you explain the reasons for this?

A. Our women have reached a degree of conscience where they can decide for themselves. Usually, husband and wife decide, together, whether they want to have more children, and it is not the task of our state or our government to prevent them from deciding this question. You see, we like children very much, so all families who can afford it have children. [The question was further touched upon in a 1960, Moscow-published, booklet on the *Rights of Soviet Women* which states, on page 62: "To enable women to decide for themselves the questions of motherhood and also to forestall the harm caused by abortions made outside hospitals, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet published the law of November 23, 1955, rescinding the prohibition of abortions." The dangers of abortion, even under proper medical supervision, are still stressed, and we found when we visited medical centers that women are encouraged to depend on contraception for family limitation.]

Q. What proportion of married women and women with children work?

A. I do not have the exact figures. About half of our working people are women, so most women work. How many are married and have children, it is difficult to say.

Q. To have the mother work must require a lot of cooperation on the part of their husbands. At least that is our experience. What is the attitude of men here? Do they help with the children, shopping, and household chores?

A. This is an important problem for every family where both work. Of course our men are willing to help their wives, not only in taking the children to school, but in some of the housework. It is only a question of qualification. Men, usually, are not good cooks, but they do help with other kinds of housework.

Q. How is the question of legal residence or domicile decided?

A. Both husband and wife have the right to decide. But, in my practice, I have never met real disagreement on the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

question of domicile. I think, when both parties have good will to achieve an agreement, it is always possible to do so. They choose according to their mutual interest.

Q. It must sometimes be a problem, though, when a husband and wife get jobs in different areas.

A. Usually this is a temporary situation, but people who want to join husband or wife in another region are helped to find the same kind of job there. For instance, a woman who is a teacher, and wants to follow her husband to another area, can always get permission to quit her job and find work there. Sometimes, we find a case in which a husband wants to leave in order to follow his wife.

Q. If a marriage does not work out and a couple decide to get a divorce, what are the procedures?

A. If a marriage has broken up, that is, if people decide, and they have some reasons, to get a divorce, they can get it. They address a People's Court. Our law does not contain a list of grounds for divorce. We have one principle: the People's Court—or the court of the city, or a region which judges the case—must always ask: "Is there very serious ground to think that this marriage cannot be saved?" The prime task of the court is to try and reconcile the couple, especially when there are small children in the family. As I said, we have no list of grounds. This means that every ground that is considered a reason for divorce in other countries may be so considered in our country, too. For instance, infidelity, cruelty, or neglect. But it is not automatic. It may be that infidelity will not bring a divorce. It is up to the court to decide, and each case is judged individually. [Approximately 5 percent of the cases reaching the divorce court are successfully reconciled. The divorce rate is about 1.1 per 1000 population, about half of ours, according to Soviet statistics.]

Q. When people get a divorce, do they hire their own private lawyers?

A. Divorce cases are not so complicated. There is seldom need for a lawyer. But if they want one they can get a lawyer.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And, if they are not satisfied with the court's decision, they can appeal to a higher court and can hire a lawyer to write a petition to the higher court. Usually they write it themselves, because in divorce cases there are no very difficult legal points; rather there is sometimes a difficult condition of life which is better known by the party himself than by the lawyer.

Q. What rights do parents have when there is divorce?

A. Husband and wife have equal rights in every question, and equal right in the question of guardianship of children. It is usually the mother who asks for guardianship of the children, but the court determines which of the parents will take better care of the children. If it is the mother, then the children will stay with her and the father is obliged to pay some alimony. If it is the father, then the mother is obliged to pay. But I have very seldom seen a case in which the mother was not granted the care of the children.

Q. Does the child have anything to say about this?

A. When a child has reached the age of 10, he is always asked with which parent he wants to stay, and his opinion has great weight. But small children cannot judge, and it is up to the court to decide.

Q. If there are no children, is the wife entitled to alimony?

A. In our country, women and men are equal. This means that either person, in case of divorce, can get alimony if he or she cannot work—is an invalid—and has no means of support. A young and healthy woman will get no alimony from her divorced husband.

Q. How about property settlements? If a couple own a house or furniture or savings, how are these divided?

A. The property they had before marriage stays their separate property, their personal property. All they acquired during the marriage will be divided. If they cannot agree how to divide it, the court will decide. In principle, it must be divided into equal parts, but this depends, too, with whom the children stay. If they stay with the mother, she will be given more.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Q. What is the position of an unmarried mother in the USSR?

A. The state helps unmarried mothers. She gets a certain sum of money from the state every month to support the child, but of course, if there is difficulty for her she can take her child to a children's home where the child is brought up, educated by the state. The mother pays nothing for it, but she always has the right to take her child back, so she does not lose the child.

Q. But does such a child have the chance to be adopted by a family where there might be two parents?

A. People who want to adopt a child have to address themselves to a children's home, but it is better to choose an orphan because if the child has a parent—mother or father—adoption is only with the consent of the parent. And mothers, usually, don't give their consent for their children to be adopted because, in this case, they lose their right. It means the adopted child is considered as a child of these people, and it would be difficult for the mother later to claim the child. The adoption of such children is rare. We have very few children to adopt. I have heard of very good couples who look for such children and cannot find them.

Q. Are there any racial or religious restrictions on adoption?

A. There are no such restrictions in our country for marriage or adoption. We don't know such restrictions.

Q. We have heard about boarding schools in the Soviet Union. Some people believe that children are put in these schools whether or not the parents wish this.

A. They are greatly mistaken. Boarding schools are a very good way to educate children because they are there with other children which is not always possible in a family. When the family is small and the child stays alone, or always with grown-up people, he will tend to be more selfish and, sometimes, not as well brought up as at boarding school.

Q. But, don't children need to be with their parents? I understand, too, that some of these children come from very large families.

A. Yes, sometimes. Of course, it is a question that must be decided in every particular case. If it is possible to arrange

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a good education for children at home, in a large family where the mother can look after them, very often they stay at home. But, as a general rule, we think it does not mean weakening family bonds when children stay away during the week. They always come back Saturday evening and Sunday. They stay with their families for two days, and they appreciate it. Being with them is a greater pleasure for children than if they were home all the week.

Q. *Who makes the decision about children going to boarding schools?*

A. The parents. It is not forced. Up to now, it is considered a privilege, especially for mothers who have no husband, or widows for whom it is a great relief to have the children at a boarding school and to have them home for the week-end. Up to now, we have not had so many boarding schools that we could speak of sending all children there. [Parents, we found, pay part of the cost of boarding schools, day nurseries, kindergartens, and summer camps, according to their income. Some children receive complete scholarships. It was our general impression that there are influential teachers who favor eventually including all children in the boarding school program, and others, strongly opposed, who hope that the trend will be reversed when housing needs have been fully met, and working hours for parents, especially mothers, are further reduced. At present, the boarding schools may serve to offset unfavorable conditions for children who come from unstable or broken families, or other difficult environmental situations.]

Q. *Do you think that family ties in your country are as close as they were two or three generations ago?*

A. I am sure it is so; and speaking to elderly people who remember the family of old days, they will tell you that, in spite of great social changes, the family is as close, or even closer, now because it is free of money and other economic questions. People marry when they really want to spend their lives together. The family is now approaching an ideal which will be achieved in the near future, when there will be no other considerations but love and mutual respect.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD EVENTS

By Scott Nearing

Force and Violence in the "Free World"

On May 30, 1961, Dictator Rafael Leonidas Trujillo was assassinated on a public highway near Ciudad Trujillo, the capital city from which he had ruled the Dominican Republic during three decades, organized a network of Trujillo properties, and built a Trujillo-dominated political machine. At the time of his death, Trujillo exercised undisputed mastery over the Dominican Republic and its 2.8 million inhabitants.

Through the next four months, other members of the Trujillo family maneuvered to stabilize the 32-year-old Trujillo dictatorship and to protect the multi-million-dollar family fortune. During this period Dr. Joaquin Balaguer, chief of state and a Trujillo man, tried to stabilize Trujillo rule, to placate opposition forces, to allay popular unrest, and to hold his titular position in the face of multiplying difficulties.

Three Dominican groups were jostling one another to take over the power which was slipping through the fingers of two brothers and a son of the former dictator. The armed forces and the police, under the command of Rafael L. Trujillo, Jr., son of the dead dictator, were the agencies relied upon by the Trujillo family to protect their interests and preserve their power. The second group consisted of liberals and conservatives who had opposed the Trujillo government. This group was neither integrated nor organized, and many of its leaders were living in exile. The third group, equally heterogeneous, was composed of Castroites and other leftists.

There was a fourth party deeply involved in the Dominican crisis—the government in Washington. It was under Washington's leadership that the Trujillo dictatorship had been repudiated by the Organization of American States. Whether the cloak-and-dagger tactics that led to the assassination on May 30 were also designed in Washington is being debated inside and outside the Dominican Republic. But with the elder Trujillo festering in his bloody shroud, American interests required the replacement of the Trujillo family by elements that could be relied

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon to follow Washington's lead, and bring the Dominican Republic back into the Organization of American States as an integral part of a U.S.-dominated American community.

Dominican affairs reached a crisis during the last days of November. On November 17, after considerable prodding, Rafael L. Trujillo, Jr., resigned as chief of the armed forces and the police, and left the country. President Balaguer promptly took command of both services. At the same time, Secretary of State Rusk announced that the United States would not sit idly by while members of the family threatened to re-establish the Trujillo dictatorship.

Secretary Rusk's stand was supported from three directions. United States army, navy, and air force officers who had helped to train and equip the Dominican armed forces were in the Republic "on vacation" and got in touch with some of their erstwhile Dominican pupils. At the same time, United States Consul General John Calvin Hill moved to the center of the Dominican stage. Secretary of State Rusk backed up his subordinate on November 18 by announcing that the Trujillo brothers were plotting a comeback and that Washington was planning "further measures" to block them. What happened next is reported as follows by *U.S. News & World Report* (December 4):

> On Sunday, November 19, it became apparent to all in this island republic just what some of these "further measures" involved. Rumors flying about this renamed capital city . . . had drawn a number of Dominicans to the waterfront. There, on Sunday, they saw three U.S. warships appear on the horizon. The U.S. Navy's guided-missile cruiser *Little Rock* and two destroyers moved to the three-mile limit of Dominican waters and remained there.
>
> In the course of the day the U.S. Navy's carrier *Valley Forge* appeared in the area. A flight of U.S. Navy fighter planes took off from her deck on reconnaissance outside Dominican territorial waters, but plainly visible from the mainland. Within a few days the U.S. fleet in the area totaled 14 units, including the carrier *Franklin D. Roosevelt* and various landing craft. . . . Aboard these units was a battalion landing team of 1,800 U.S. Marines. This unit matched the force which executed a successful landing in Lebanon in 1959.

On the same day (Sunday) Dr. Balaguer, "operating on a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plan backed by the United States" (*U.S. News & World Report*) declared martial law and invited the Trujillos to leave the Republic. The next day a chartered Pan-American plane took 29 members of the Trujillo party to Miami, where they "checked into luxury hotels." *U.S. News* adds this note: "The Trujillo family, at this writing, is believed to have some 90 million dollars hidden away in U.S. and other foreign accounts."

New York Times reporters included the following paragraph in their dispatches published on November 20:

> The presence of United States naval units offshore and the flight of American planes emphasized to Dominicans the possibility of United States armed intervention to preserve peace and prevent a return of tyranny. This threat carried the more weight since the United States had intervened in Dominican affairs previously, with the marines occuping the country from 1916 to 1934.

This is the first and most noteworthy aspect of the Dominican overturn. United States military units in overwhelming force were on the spot. There was nothing secret about the episode. Washington authorities boasted that they had the situation in hand.

When the question was raised in the United Nations on November 24, spokesmen for the Dominican government assured their fellow delegates that the presence of United States naval and air units in the vicinity of Santo Domingo was "most healthy." State Department officials hoped that the story would end there, with the Trujillos snugly housed in Miami, side by side with their opposite numbers from Cuba. But dramas of such magnitude cannot be erased like chalk marks on the pavement. The long-suffering Dominican people were demanding their day in court.

The people began by cheering the end of the "Trujillo Era." From street celebrations the crowds went on to loot the housing and business properties belonging to the Trujillo family. The looting seems to have been systematic, involving the removal of everything worth carrying away, including doors and windows. The police did not interfere. Eyewitnesses reported the crowds as shouting: "They robbed us for thirty years, now it is our turn!" After the cheering and the looting came a general

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strike, aimed to overthrow the government headed by Dr. Balaguer, the former Trujillo follower.

This whirlwind of transformation had been concentrated in a week of breath-taking change. *Time* commented (December 1):

> At week's end President Balaguer found himself in shaky control. . . . Balaguer worked to form a transitional coalition government. In this he was backed by the moderately leftist Dominican Revolutionary Party's longtime anti-Trujillo exile Juan Bosch, by Fiallo's middle-of-the-road National Civic Union, and by some elements of the leftist Fourteenth of June. A risky intervention, done with speed and good intentions, seemed to be working.

It was an intervention all right—a speedy, well-executed intervention. But its workability remained to be demonstrated. It was easy for the United States to prevent action by the United Nations and the Organization of American States on complaints directed by the Cuban government against this flagrant United States foray into the domestic affairs of a Latin American state. It was quite another matter to eradicate the widespread Latin American apprehension concerning the immense wealth-power superiority of the Colossus of the North.

Like the invasion of Cuba in April, 1961, Washington's intervention in the internal affairs of the Dominican Republic in November provided irrefutable testimony in support of two assumptions widely current in Latin America. The first assumption is that without the approval or even the knowledge of the people of the United States, a nod from the State Department will concentrate overwhelming military force against any one of the dozen republics bordering on the Caribbean. The second assumption is that when United States interests are threatened or when United States policy is questioned, Washington can be expected to by-pass the OAS or the UN and to act directly through its diplomatic and consular services, its CIA, and its armed forces to implement United States policy.

The Teetery Dollar

Intervention in the affairs of neighboring nations is dramatic and spectacular. Economic forces, on the contrary, often operate so insidiously that they are unnoticed until they have undermined the foundations of an economy. Take the run on

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United States gold reserves as an example. Only a few short years ago the United States held a near monopoly of the yellow metal, with a total of $24.6 billion, 99.4 percent of which was held by the Treasury. Today the gold reserve is below $17 billion. More serious than this reduction in gold holdings is the fact that year by year the United States spends more abroad than it takes in, with a consequent unbalance in international credits and debits against the United States.

"The over-all deficit in the U.S. balance of payments as measured by net transfers of gold and liquid dollar assets to foreigners would have been at an annual rate of more than $1.5 billion in the first half of 1961 except for advanced repayments made on government loans," the *Federal Reserve Bulletin* reported in its October issue. This deficit resulted chiefly from "movements of short term and volatile capital."

The seriousness of the international credit position appeared in the Federal Reserve Board's statistics of short-term liabilities to foreigners as reported by banks in the United States. In December, 1956, these debts to foreigners stood at $14.9 billion. Three years later, in December 1959, they had risen to $19.4 billion. In December, 1960, they were up by another billion. In August, 1961, they totalled $21.6 billion, a rise of fifty percent in the five years since 1956. (*Federal Reserve Bulletin,* October 1961, p. 1258.)

In 1956, gold reserves in the United States were $21.9 billion, or $7 billion more than the short-term dollar debts owed to foreigners. In 1961 the situation had been reversed. With short-term debts to foreigners reported at $21.6 billion, gold reserves had fallen below $16.9 billion, showing a net deficit of four and a half billion dollars. This reversal of position has led foreigners to withdraw their short-term capital in the form of gold exports, with the indicated decrease in United States gold holdings from $21.9 billion in 1956 to less than $17 billion in the closing months of 1961.

Should foreign holders of short-term claims against the United States demand payment in gold, the U.S. gold reserve would disappear, leaving four billions of claims unsatisfied.

This apparent weakness in the international position of the dollar led foreign speculators to bid heavily against the dollar

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

during the closing months of 1960. The run on the dollar led the new Washington administration to declare that it would defend the international position of the dollar at all costs. "Nevertheless, outflows of short-term credits and volatile capital remained large and added to the over-all deficit in the first half of the year." (*Federal Reserve Bulletin*, October 1961, p. 1133.) In one week (ending Wednesday, November 22, 1961) the total outflow of gold from the United States reported by the New York Federal Reserve Bank reached the record total of $300 million, reducing United States gold holdings to less than $17 billion for the first time in 22 years. During the third quarter of 1961 the United States deficit in international payments reached an annual rate of more than $3 billion.

Late in November, 1961, the *Wall Street Journal* headed a first page report on United States gold losses "Dollar Dangers." The article pointed out that the present large outflow of gold could be rapidly increased: "if significant numbers of foreign holders of dollars get suspicious about inflationary tendencies in the U.S., they might feel impelled to convert an increased proportion of their dollars into gold." A probable deficit of $6.9 billion or more in the federal budget for the current fiscal year is creating increased uneasiness abroad concerning dollar stability. The German mark, the Swiss franc, and the Dutch florin all rate higher than the U.S. dollar as "hard" or stable currencies. This is not only a blatantly obvious fact of international finance, but it has been growing more serious for years and presently has entered a critical phase during which foreign investors in United States funds are forced to ask themselves the crucial question: "Will the dollar weaken to a point at which its devaluation is inevitable?"

Forced devaluation of the dollar under foreign pressure would seriously undermine the international economic position of the United States. The suggestion of such a possibility is brushed aside by Treasury Secretary Dillon. Persistent budget deficits, additional borrowings, and progressive gold losses extended over years certainly point toward a dollar devaluation that would have a profound effect on the capacity of the United States to continue foreign aid policies which are the chief unifying force in the OAS, SEATO, and NATO.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR PRESS BOOKS

	List Price	Price with Sub
THE ALIENATION OF MODERN MAN by Fritz Pappenheim, paper	$1.25	$ 6.00
AMERICAN RADICALS edited by Harvey Goldberg, paper	1.25	6.00
AMERICAN LABOR IN MIDPASSAGE Bert Cochran, Ed., paper	1.25	6.00
MAN'S WORLDLY GOODS by Leo Huberman, paper	1.75	6.00
CUBA—ANATOMY OF A REVOLUTION by Huberman and Sweezy paper cloth	1.75 3.50	6.00 7.00
GUERRILLA WARFARE by Che Guevara	3.50	7.00
CROSSING THE LINE by Claud Cockburn	3.50	7.00
AN ESSAY ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND PLANNING by Maurice Dobb	3.50	7.00
THE JAZZ SCENE by Francis Newton	4.00	8.00
THE ALIENATION OF MODERN MAN by Fritz Pappenheim	4.00	8.00
THE WALL BETWEEN by Anne Braden	5.00	8.00
THE CHINESE ECONOMY by Solomon Adler	5.00	8.00
THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF GROWTH by Paul A. Baran	5.00	8.00
NORTH FROM MEXICO by Carey McWilliams	5.00	8.00
THE THEORY OF CAPITALIST DEVELOPMENT by Paul M. Sweezy	6.00	9.00
THE GREAT ROAD by Agnes Smedley	6.75	10.00
CASTE, CLASS & RACE by Oliver C. Cox	7.50	10.00
FROM YALTA TO DISARMAMENT by J. P. Morray	8.50	11.00

Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Avenue New York 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IN MEMORIAM

On November 22, Jack McManus, general manager of the *National Guardian,* died suddenly of a heart attack. There will be a memorial meeting in his honor. We urge you to attend.

We urge you to attend because you will honor yourself when you honor Jack McManus. Twenty-one years ago, shortly after the newspaper PM was founded, a notice appeared on the bulletin board in the newsroom, announcing the formation of the PM unit of the American Newspaper Guild. It was signed by the Labor Editor and the Radio Editor. The Radio Editor, Jack McManus, was a close friend of the management of the paper, and if he had been interested in his own welfare above that of his fellow-workers, he would not have helped organize the union there. But Jack McManus, from the beginning of his career, had answered for himself the crucial question: Which side are you on? And he fought nobly and well, on that side, until he died.

When the news of his death came, I remembered first Jack's charm and wit, and then I remembered an article written by Paul Baran, entitled "The Commitment of the Intellectual." In a period when the ruling class becomes more reactionary than ever because its social order is crumbling, says Baran, it falls to the lot of the true intellectual

> both as a responsibility and a privilege, to save from extinction the tradition of humanism, reason, and progress that constitutes our most valuable inheritance from the entire history of mankind.
>
> It may be said that I am identifying being an intellectual with being a hero, that it is unreasonable to demand from people that they should withstand all the pressures of vested interests and brave all the dangers to their individual well-being for the sake of human advancement. I agree that it would be unreasonable to *demand* it. Nor do I. But from history we know of many individuals who have been able, even in its darkest ages and under the most trying conditions, to transcend their private selfish interests and to subordinate them to the interest of society as a whole. It always took much courage, much integrity, and much ability.

Jack McManus had courage, integrity, ability. He fitted this description of the intellectual as a hero.

We cherish his memory.

This is the text of a statement by Leo Huberman at the Monthly Review Associates meeting of December 5, 1961.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from inside back cover*)

We have in preparation an excellent pamphlet on disarmament. Written by six distinguished members of the Cornell faculty, the material originally appeared as a special supplement to the *Cornell Daily Sun*. Believing that it deserves a wider circulation than can be provided by a college newspaper, we have arranged to distribute it as a pamphlet. The title will be *Problems of Disarmament;* the authors are Professors Hans Bethe, Douglas Dowd, Mario Einaudi, Walter LaFeber, Philip Morrison, and Jay Orear; the price will be 35 cents for single copies, 3 for $1, and 20 for $5. Order now for prompt delivery.

Last month we published an excerpt from an Open Letter on civil defense to President Kennedy by 183 university faculty members from the Boston area (MR, December 1961, p. 374). We are glad to be able to report this month that the same statement has now been adopted by no fewer than 730 faculty members of more than 20 New York institutions of higher learning. As we go to press, it is announced that the full text of the Open Letter will be published as a full-page ad in the *New York Times* of December 19th. We suggest that MR readers on other faculties around the country take the initiative in organizing the same project in their own areas.

Canadian readers have written to say that there are two mistakes in the "Letter from Canada" which appeared on p. 298 of the November issue. "Knights of Columbus" should read "Knights of the Round Table" (a small but distinguished group of liberals), and "CBS" should read "CBC" (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation). Thanks for the corrections.

A Medical Aid to Cuba Committee is now in operation with the primary objective of supplying drugs which for one reason or another the Cuban authorities are unable to obtain. The Committee is completely nonpolitical and has no connections with any other organization. Those wishing to contribute to its work or who would like further information should write to the Committee at 147 West 33 Street, Room 409, New York, N. Y.

Happy New Year!

SPAIN TODAY

Monthly Newsletter published by

COMMITTEE FOR A DEMOCRATIC SPAIN

Waldo Frank, Chairman
Freda Kirchwey, Otto Nathan, Vice Chairmen
Mario De Salegui, Secretary

Uncensored facts from inside Spain

Subscription $3 a Year

Address Secretary
Box 159 Cathedral Station
New York 25

(Advertisement)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from inside front cover*)

in a last will and testament is all that is required: "I hereby devise and bequeath the sum of dollars ($) to Monthly Review, Inc., 333 Sixth Avenue, New York 14, N. Y."

We know of a number of readers who have acted on our suggestion that books and magazines be sent to British Guiana (Freedom House, 41 Robb Street, Lacytown, Georgetown, BG). Several have asked us what is the best method of shipment. The answer is: by regular post. Packages should be unsealed (string is all right but no tape). For books the limit per package is 11 pounds; for printed matter other than books 6 pounds.

The mendacity of the U.S. press in its reporting on Cuba reached a new high in connection with Castro's recent speech describing the evolution of his political thinking. According to James Wechsler of the *New York Post,* the UPI dispatch, which was carried by most papers, was written by a Cuban exile in Miami. It reported that Castro said "he really has been a dedicated Communist since his college days but he concealed his views so it would be easier to seize power." Actually, he said he had *not* been a Communist in his college days; and as for the present he said he was a Marxist-Leninist, not a Communist. Since other recent reporting on Cuba (if any) has been on the same level of accuracy, we are running in this issue a couple of reports just received from friends on the spot. At the same time, we are trying to get hold of a complete text of Castro's controversial speech. If it seems desirable, we will run all or parts of it in a future issue.

A couple of enterprising MR readers have written a book entitled *"The New Freedom": Corporate Capitalism* which they hope to distribute in an entirely novel fashion—by sending it free to a small number of readers who would undertake to reproduce it and send it to others on the same terms. We are not quite persuaded that the idea will work, but we are glad to help in giving it a trial. Anyone who would be interested in participating in this project should get in touch with Fredy Perlman, 133 Henry Street, New York 2, N. Y. (telephone: REctor 2-8852).

As you know, MR Press published an English translation of Che Guevara's *Guerrilla Warfare* last July. It was a 128-page book and had a list price of $3.50 (prepublication to MR readers, $2.00). We sent out the usual number of review copies—to the *New York Times* among others, of course. No review in the *Times,* also of course. Several months later, Praeger published the same book in a different translation. This new edition was 88 pages and sold for $3.95. And now, lo and behold, just look at what happened next. The *Times* was so impressed with the importance of this work that it promptly (November 26th) published a half-page review in the Sunday book review section by no less a dignitary than its own military editor, Hanson W. Baldwin. We have often wondered in the past why MR Press books never seem to get reviewed in papers like the *New York Times.* Now we know. The reason is very simple—because they are not published by Praeger (or Macmillan or Doubleday or Harper's or any one of a dozen or so other publishing houses that happen to meet with the approval of the *Times'* august board of censors). Anyway, it's nice to have mysteries like this cleared up.

The federal government is reported to be printing 60 million civil defense pamphlets for mailing to all households. One of our readers suggests that all who want to protest against this cruel hoax should write "Return to Sender" on the envelope containing the pamphlet and put it into the nearest mailbox. We are going to act on this suggestion.

(*continued on page* 432)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MONTHLY REVIEW *Associates*

invites you to renew your subscription to MR automatically, and at the same time:

- help support the magazine and extend its influence as one of the few remaining voices of progress
- attend, free of charge, all MR Associates lectures if you live in the New York area, or get 1/3 off the list price of any MR Press book if you live outside the New York area
- receive, without cost, all pamphlets published by MR

Whether your subscription expires with the next issue—or not for another year—makes no difference. Joining the Associates now adds a full year to your present subscription.

To
renew your subscription to MR
help MR grow

JOIN NOW

MONTHLY REVIEW ASSOCIATES
333 Sixth Avenue, New York 14, N. Y.

I enclose ..... dollars. Please enroll me as an MR Associate.

Check category (annual) below.

☐	$ 10 - $14	Contributing Associate
☐	$ 15 - $49	Supporting Associate
☐	$ 50 - $99	Sustaining Associate
☐	$100 and over	Foundation Associate

Note: Your choice of any MR Press book will be sent FREE to anyone becoming a Supporting Associate or better ($15 or more).

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zone ..... State .....

Please make your check payable to Monthly Review Associates

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED